

WILKINSON, BARKER, KNAUER & QUINN

LAW OFFICES

1735 NEW YORK AVENUE, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006-5289

(202) 783-4141

TELECOPIER

(202) 783-5851
(202) 833-2360

RECEIVED
Aug 8 '94
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S OFFICE
GERMAN OFFICE
GOETHESTRASSE 23
60313 FRANKFURT, GERMANY
011-49-69-20876
011-49-69-297-8453 (TELECOPIER)

August 3, 1994

Andrew S. Fishel
Managing Director
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street N.W., Room 852, M/S 1100
Washington, DC 20554

Re: GN Docket No. 90-314

Dear Mr. Fishel:

On July 8, 1994, your office published a Public Notice (43840) announcing the receipt of a May 27, 1994 letter in the above-referenced docket from Mr. Mark H. Blake, Treasurer, Community Service Telephone Co. The Notice suggested that Mr. Blake's letter was received subsequent to release of the June 2, 1994 Sunshine Agenda in that proceeding, thus prohibited under Section 1.1203 of the Commission's Rules. This presentation has therefore been placed in a file associated with, but not made a part of the record in this proceeding.

Mr. Blake was careful to assure that his letter was delivered to the Commission well before the anticipated release of the Sunshine Agenda. As the enclosed date stamped copy of the letter indicates, his letter was received in the Secretary's office on May 31, 1994, and it is his understanding that the copies to the various Commissioners and staff members were similarly hand delivered to the Secretary's office on that date. Since his letter clearly is not a prohibited communication, Mr. Blake would respectfully request that his correspondence be included in the record of this proceeding, along with all other correspondence timely received by the Commission prior to the issuance of the Sunshine Agenda.

Your assistance in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Yours very sincerely,


Lawrence J. Movshin

Enclosures



PUBLIC NOTICE

470917

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
1919 M STREET N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

43830

News media information 202/632-5050. Recorded listing of releases and texts 202/632-0002.

July 8, 1994

Notice of Prohibited Presentation
Received During Sunshine Period

GN Docket No. 90-314
(RM-7140, 7175 and 7618)

Amendment of the Commission's Rules to Establish
New Personal Communications Services

This serves to provide notice of a written presentation concerning the above-referenced proceeding. This presentation, in the form of a letter dated May 27, 1994 from Mr. Mark H. Blake, Treasurer, Community Service Telephone Co., was received subsequent to release of the June 2, 1994 Sunshine Agenda, but prior to release of the text of the Commission decision. This correspondence is therefore prohibited under Section 1.1203 of the Commission's Rules. A copy of this presentation has been placed in a file associated with (but not made a part of) the record in the proceeding, and is available for public inspection. See 47 CFR Sections 1.1203 and 1.1212(e), (f).

All future correspondence relating to this matter (or proceeding) received during the Sunshine Period will be placed in a public file associated with but not a part of the record.

Action by the Managing Director.

RECEIVED
AUG 8 1994
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY



**Community
Service Telephone Co.**

33 MAIN ST., P.O. BOX 400
WINTHROP, MAINE 04364
TEL: (207) 377-9911
FAX: (207) 377-9969

N.J. SAVARD, PRESIDENT

May 27, 1994

Honorable Reed E. Hundt, Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Room 814, Mail Stop Code 0101
Washington DC 20554

Mr. Ralph A. Haller, Chief, Private Radio Bureau
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission PCS Task Force
2025 M Street, N.W.
Room 5002, Mail Stop Code 1700
Washington, DC 20554

Re: General Docket 90-314 Establishment of Rules, **Broadband Personal Communications Services**

Gentlemen:

As the Commission moves toward final reconsideration of the Broadband PCS rules, I'm sure you have heard from many different sources about various problems associated with the proposed minimum construction requirements. I would like to add our company's voice to those concerns, and provide you with some insight on the likely impact that those requirements will have on small, rural companies like Community Services Telephone Company (CST) if they are not substantially modified on reconsideration.

Our company does not oppose imposition of reasonable construction requirements and benchmark deadlines by which service to certain percentages of area and/or population must be implemented. Such deadlines may be helpful in assuring full frequency utilization and encouraging system development in non-urban areas. While the time frame and percentages will continue to be the subject of substantial debate, we are prepared to live with whatever the Commission ultimately establishes in this regard.

What we cannot tolerate is the possibility that the failure to meet these construction or coverage benchmarks will result in the **revocation** of the license for the **entire franchised market**. That is far too great a risk for a company of our size and resources to undertake. Unless this forfeiture approach is modified, CST (and I suspect others) will not participate.

By imposing an absolute and total forfeiture on licensees who fail to meet all of the imposed benchmarks, the Commission **requires** applicants to **wager** that there is a reasonable demand for **services not yet fully defined, using equipment not yet even developed, at a capital cost**

structure **not yet enumerated**. Further, risk is likely to be greatest in the rural areas where the cost of serving small population densities creates the greatest challenges.

Of course, any party interested in bidding for a PCS license will be required to make many assumptions about such factors in determining how to value the license in the auction. However, to impose a license forfeiture on winning bidders whose assumptions turn out to be too optimistic or leaving as the only effective alternative to such forfeiture, the potentially uneconomic buildout of systems to meet the benchmark requirements, is simply not a acceptable penalty for incorrectly forecasting long-term market demands.

CST is seriously interested in providing PCS type services here in Maine. Bringing PCS to the rural population which characterizes most of the state of Maine will be a significant challenge. Having established certain assumptions and run several different business cases, it is quite apparent that if CST is successful in obtaining a PCS license for all or any part of the state of Maine independently or as a part of a regional consortium, it will be required to commit significant resources to that system development. We simply cannot and will not enter the PCS auction knowing that it will risk the loss of its **entire** investment because we may fail to meet long-range benchmarks. Nor can CST risk the possibility that it must make clearly uneconomic capital investments to meet arbitrary benchmarks at some point in the future to protect its sound investment in other areas of the franchise.

In the cellular industry, there were and still are many areas where licensees have chosen not to provide coverage during their five-year fill-in period. These market-driven decisions did not result in a forfeiture of the cellular license; rather, the license holder lost its exclusive rights to serve the unserved territory, and other interested parties were able to apply for licenses to serve those areas that the initial licenses did not. In this fashion, the marketplace, and not the Commission, drove the delivery of services to the consumer. Market definitions were not based on any preconceived licensee construction plan or design.

The Commission has consistently stated that it wants to allow licensees substantial flexibility in designing PCS systems and services to meet consumers needs and desires. The imposition of an absolute and total license forfeiture on licensees who fail to meet even the last of the benchmarks introduces regulatory burdens on system design and construction that may be directly contrary to the marketplace economic forces on which the FCC otherwise wants to rely.

An approach like that used in the cellular industry allows licensees a reasonable time to design and develop a market, restructure service offerings and or construction activity to correlate projections with actual performance. This approach creates significant incentives on licensees to expand their services within their franchised markets as well. A license's winning auction bid will likely be based on maintaining the license for the **entire** market area for the **entire** license term and beyond. A licensee who fails to meet any particular benchmark, and thus loses the exclusive right to unserved territory will suffer the loss of value associated with the area that is confiscated and re-auctioned to another licensee.

Broadband Personal Communications Services

Page 3

May 27, 1994

CST wants to participate in PCS; we firmly believe that the success of PCS in rural areas depends on the participation of small telephone companies and other local businesses whose primary interest is the development of these rural markets. However, no business planner can be so sure of his assumptions in so new and undefined an area as PCS that it can "guarantee" the ability to develop any given percentage of a market by any given time. Just such a guarantee would be required before CST and similarly situated companies could responsibly risk their resources in a venture that is, as the Commission's rules currently prescribe, "all-or-nothing." As you move toward a final reconsideration of the Broadband PCS service rules, please give strong consideration to revising this construction benchmark penalty, so that CST and other small companies can participate in PCS with reasonably balanced risks and rewards.

While travel to DC is difficult at this time, I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this specific matter with either of you by telephone at your convenience.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark H. Blake". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, stylized "M" and "B".

Mark H. Blake, Treasurer

cc: Honorable Andrew C. Barrett, Commissioner
Honorable James H. Quello, Commissioner
Honorable Rachelle Chong, Commissioner
Honorable Susan Ness, Commissioner
Dr. Robert M. Pepper, Chief, Private Radio Bureau
Dr. Michael L. Katz, Chief Economist
Dr. Thomas P. Stanley, Chief Engineer
Mr. A. Richard Metzger, Esq., Chief Common Carrier Bureau